

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

	APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
•	10/791,386	03/03/2004	Minoru Sakai	FS-F03230-01	3510		
	37398 7590 12/29/2006 TAIYO CORPORATION		6	EXAMINER			
	401 HOLLANI			CHEA, THORL			
	#407 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
	•			1752			
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE		Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
3 MONTHS		NTHS	12/29/2006	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/791,386	SAKAI ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Thorl Chea	1752				
	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet with th	e correspondence address				
Period fo	• •						
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING D PRISON OF THE MAILING D PRISON OF THE MAILING D SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period are to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailined patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATI 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS free, cause the application to become ABANDO	ON. e timely filed rom the mailing date of this communication. DNED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status		•					
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>03 March 2004</u> .						
2a)□	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This	s action is non-final.					
3)	3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	ion of Claims						
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application	· ·	•				
-	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)	5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-35</u> is/are rejected.						
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.						
8)	8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Applicati	ion Papers		•				
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.					
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11)	11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority (under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•					
12)⊠	12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).						
a)	a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:						
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prior	=	eived in this National Stage				
	application from the International Burea	' ''	:				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.							
	•						
÷							
Attachmen		A) 🗀 latan dan (0	OR (PTO 412)				
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Ll Interview Summ Paper No(s)/Mai	I Date				
3) 🖾 Infon	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) or No(s)/Mail Date 20040707.	5) Notice of Informa 6) Other:	al Patent Application				

Art Unit: 1752

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2. Claims 1-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention lacks patentable utility. The claimed invention is related to "an image forming method", but there is no actual processing steps provided therein. The process is inoperative and lacks ultility.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

- 4. Claims 1-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential steps, such omission amounting to a gap between the steps. See MPEP § 2172.01. The omitted steps are: the step of imagewise exposure of the photothermographic material with a laser beam and the step of heating the imagewise exposed the photothermographic material are necessary in the formation of an image using the photothermographic material. There are no such steps presented in the invention claimed in claims 1, 15 and 30.
- 5. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Art Unit: 1752

6. Claims 30-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The specification fails to teach as how to form an image from a photothermographic material in the absence of first imagewise exposing a photothermographic material before thermally developing the material to produce an image.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 8. Claims 15-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Toya et al (US Patent No. 6,335,153), Harai et al (US 6,475,715B2), and Hirabayashi et al (US Patent 6,468,720)

Toya et al discloses an image forming apparatus including exposed portion (16) equipped with a laser beam scanner and heat development portion (18) with conveying roller pairs of the conveying section 17 for developing a photothermographic material. See Fig 1; page 22, lines 25-60, and the polyhalogenate compound in column 29, lines 14-65. Harai et al disclose a photothermographic material used in the process of the claimed invention. See the composition of the material which contains the polyhalogenate compound of the present invention in column

Art Unit: 1752

37-40, claims 1-17. Hirabyashi et al discloses heating the exposed photothermographic material at the transport speed of between 22 mm/ sec to 40 mm/sec to develop the exposed photothermographic material. See Fig. 1 and Fig.2 and abstract.

Toya et al do not disclose the line speed of the thermal development of 20 mm/sec or higher, but Harabayashi et al discloses the line speed of thermal development claimed in the present invention. Therefore, it would have been obvious to the worker of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to adjust the conveying roller speed in the apparatus taught in Toya et al with a known developing speed taught in Hirabayashi et al with an expectation of producing superior image, and thereby provide a process as claimed. The polyhalogenate compound have been commonly used as antifoggant for photothermographic material such as being used in Toya et al and Harai et al.

9. Claims 30-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Toya et al (US Patent No. 6,335,153) and Harai et al (US 6,475,715B2).

Toya et al discloses an image forming apparatus including exposed portion (16) equipped with a laser beam scanner and heat development portion (18) with conveying roller pairs of the conveying section 17 for developing a photothermographic material. The photothermographic material is developing at temperature from 100°C to 140°C, and the development time from 1 to 180 seconds. See Fig 1; page 22, lines 25-60; page 19, lines 65-60; and the polyhalogenate compound in column 29, lines 14-65. Harai et al disclose a photothermographic material used in the process of the claimed invention. See the composition of the material which contains the polyhalogenate compound of the present invention in column 37-40, claims 1-17. It would have been obvious to the worker of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to

Application/Control Number: 10/791,386 Page 5

Art Unit: 1752

thermally develop of the material taught in Toya et al with an interval of time of 1 to 180 seconds relatively to the temperature disclosed therein with an expectation of forming an image. The interval of time of 12 second or less is within the range taught in Toya et al. The polyhalogenate compound have been commonly used as antifoggant for photothermographic material such as being used in Toya et al and Harai et al.

Claims 1-35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oyamada et 10. al (US 2004/0038156A1) or Yamane et al (US 2004/0058281) in combination with Harai et al (US 6,475,715B2). Oyamada discloses a method for processing a photothermographic material using an apparatus having imagewise exposure portion annexed to heat developing portion. The photothermographic material is exposed and thermally developed during transportation at transportation speed of 23 mm/sec, and the time period for development is particularly preferably 3 seconds to 12 seconds. See abstract; Fig.1; page 43, [0416] to [0417]; and from polyhalogenate compound on page 24, [0177]. Yamane discloses similar teaching. See Fig.1-3 and the description thereof on page 49, especially second column, [04770], [0419] and page 50, first column. Harai et al disclose a photothermographic material used in the process of the claimed invention. See the composition of the material which contains the polyhalogenate compound of the present invention in column 37-40, claims 1-17. It would have been obvious to the worker of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the known polyhalogenate compound in Harai et al in the material of Oyamda et al or Yamane et al in combination with the use of the apparatus disclosed therein, and thereby provide a process as claimed.

Double Patenting

Art Unit: 1752

11. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

- 12. Claims 1-29 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-8 of copending Application No. 10/448,280 in view of Harai et al (US 6,475,715B2). This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection. The polyhalogenate compound used in the present invention has been known in Harai et al, and it would have been obvious to the worker of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the polyhalogen compound in Harai in the material used in the process of the copending application to improve the image stability of the photothermographic material, and thereby provide a process as claimed.
- 13. Claims 1-29 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-18 of U.S. Patent No. 7,105,282B2 in view of Harai et al (US 6,475,715B2). The polyhalogenate compound used in the present invention has been known in Harai et al, and it would have been obvious to the worker of ordinary skill in the

Art Unit: 1752

art at the time the invention was made to use the polyhalogen compound in Harai in the material used in the process claimed in the U.S. Patent No. 7,105,282 B2 to improve the image stability of the photothermographic material, and thereby provide a process as claimed.

Conclusion

- 14. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.
- 15. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thorl Chea whose telephone number is (571) 272-1328. The examiner can normally be reached on 9 AM-5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Cynthia H. Kelly can be reached on (571)272-1526. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Art Unit: 1752

Tch

December 21, 2006

Thorl Chea Primary Examiner Art Unit 1752